

# FUR GARMENTS!

We have a very desirable line of Capes and Jackets of the latest fashionable styles, and all the popular furs.

Our goods are of the Right Styles, Right Make and Right Prices. They Look Well--Fit Well--Wear Well.

**FUR ROBES**--We have a large stock, which we are offering at a small advance from cost. A complete assortment of Trunks, Bags, Suit Cases, Hats, Caps and Gloves.

## FRIEND E. BROOKS,

795 CHAPEL STREET

STORE OPEN EVENINGS.

## Holiday Goods in Endless Variety

What more useful and serviceable gift than an article of Furniture? We would suggest that you examine our large line of Ladies' Writing Desks in Oak, Curly Birch, Mahogany and Mahogany Inlaid. Music Cabinets, Curio Tables, Curio Cabinets, Foot Rests, China Closets, Reed and Rattan Chairs in gold, white and gold, and natural finish; Cobble Seat Rockers, Fancy Floor Rockers, in plush, brocatelle, silk damask, etc.

### Parlor Suites, Easy Chairs, Couches,

Lounges, Divans, Corner Chairs, Hall Racks, Sideboards, Dining Chairs, Bookcases, Oak and Mahogany Parlor Tables, Tea Tables, etc. We especially call your attention to our very large line of Banquet Lamps and Globes; this is a new departure with us and is well worthy of your inspection. Rugs, Mats and Draperies of all kinds. Largest and Leading Housefurnishing Store in the state.

### H. B. ARMSTRONG & CO.,

89-97 Orange Street.

#### Jewelers.

### WELLS & GUNDE.

Watchmakers and Jewelers.

Full Line Sterling Silver and Silver Plated Ware.

### KIMBAL'S ANTI-RHEUMATIC RINGS

No. 788 Chapel Street.



### Precious Stone Jewelry

FOR THE

### CHRISTMAS SEASON.

Plain and Fancy Mounted Rings, Artistic Combination of Gems, Choice Selection of Opal Rings, Fancy Wreath Lace Pins, Set with Diamonds, Pearls, Rubies, etc.

### WATCHES.

The Best Watches Made, in Gold, Gold Filled or Silver Cases. Our Patrons Always Save Money. First Quality Goods, Lowest Prices.

### J. H. G. DURANT,

55 Church Street,

Opposite Postoffice.

#### Education.

MISS ADELAIDE MORSE, ELABORATE TEACHER, Apply at 25 York Street.

MR. E. A. PARSONS, Resumes Instruction on Tuesday, September 10.

STUDIOS--Soudier Building, New Haven; Albany Building, New York.

THE DESSAUER-TROOSTWYK School of Music, 781 Chapel st.

VOCAL and Instrumental Instruction, System of European Conservatories, Apply between 12 and 1 and 5 p.m. daily.

MECHANICAL DRAWING, PERSPECTIVE, MATHEMATICS, MECHANISM, ETC.

F. M. HONEY, 170 Church Street, Hartford office, Ballietts Building, Address letters to New Haven office.

#### Miscellaneous.

Take Your Wife one of those handsome Poisonous Fly Boxes. They are given free with each box of powder.

### Beef, Veal, Mutton.

Fresh Fish, Oysters and Scallops. LITCHFIELD Chickens, Turkeys and Ducks. Partridge, Quail and Woodcock.

FRESH VEGETABLES. Boston Lettuce and Cucumbers.

STAPLE GROCERIES. TABLE LUXURIES and DELICACIES.

### HURLBURN BROS.,

1074 CHAPEL STREET

## WHAT CLEVELAND SAYS

His Message to Congress on the Venezuelan Question.

Venezuela Must be Protected--War if Necessary--No Calamity So Great as Endorsement of Wrong--Monroe Doctrine Applies--Calls for a United States Commission to Ascertain the Boundary--Lord Salisbury's Reply to Olney's Note--Says United States Has No Practical Concern in the Matter--Question Not Affected by the Monroe Doctrine--What the Dispute is About.

Washington, Dec. 17.--The message which President Cleveland sent to Congress to-day in connection with the Venezuelan correspondence expressed in forcible terms his belief that the Monroe doctrine, as enunciated to Lord Salisbury in Secretary Olney's dispatch of July last, was "founded upon substantial considerations and involved our safety and welfare, and that it was fully applicable to our present conditions and was directly related to the pending controversy."

He expresses deep disappointment that the appeal of the United States for arbitration "actuated by most friendly feeling toward both nations directly concerned, addressed to the sense of justice and to the magnanimity of one of the great powers of the world and touching its relations to one comparatively weak and small, should have produced no better results."

The dispute, he says, has reached such a stage as to make it incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient accuracy what is the true divisional line between Venezuela and British Guiana, and he suggests the appointment of a commission for this purpose, stating that in making this recommendation he is "fully alive to the responsibility incurred and keenly realizes all the consequences that may follow."

"Nevertheless," he says, "while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice."

TEXT OF MESSAGE.

Washington, Dec. 17.--The President sent to Congress to-day the Venezuelan correspondence, accompanied by the following significant message:

"To the Congress: "In my annual message addressed to the Congress on the 3d inst., I called attention to the pending boundary controversy between Great Britain and the Republic of Venezuela, and recited the substance of a representation made by this government, suggesting reasons why such dispute should be submitted to arbitration for settlement, and inquiring whether it would be so submitted."

"The answer of the British government, which was then awaited, has since been received, and, together with the dispatch which it in reply, is herewith appended."

"Such reply is embodied in two communications addressed by the British prime minister to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at this capital. It will be seen that one of these communications is devoted exclusively to observations upon the Monroe doctrine, and claims that in the present instance a new and strange extension and development of this doctrine is insisted on by the United States, that the reason justifying an appeal to the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe are generally applicable 'to the state of things in which we live at the present day,' and especially inapplicable to a controversy involving the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela."

MONROE DOCTRINE STRONG AND SOUND.

"Without attempting extended argument in reply to these positions, it may not be amiss to stand that the doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation and is essential to the in-

terests of our free institutions and the tranquility maintenance of our distinctive form of government."

"It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life and cannot become obsolete while our republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the governments of the Old World, and a subject for our absolute non-interference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their government."

"Assuming, therefore, that we may properly insist upon this doctrine without regard to the state of things in which we live, or any changed conditions here or elsewhere, it is not apparent why its application may not be invoked in the present controversy."

ALL ADVANCE OF EUROPEAN SYSTEM WRONG.

"If a European power, by an extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why, to that extent, such European power does not hereby attempt to extend its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken. This is the precise action which President Monroe declared to be 'dangerous to our peace and safety,' and it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an advance of frontier or otherwise."

"It is also suggested in the British reply that we should not seek to apply the Monroe doctrine to the pending dispute because it does not embody any principle of international law which is 'founded on the general consent of nations' and that no statement, however eminent, or no nation, however powerful, are competent to insert into the code of international law a novel principle which was never recognized before, and which has not since been accepted by the government of any other country."

THE PRINCIPLE AT STAKE.

"Practically the principle for which we contend has peculiar, if not exclusive relation to the United States. It may not have been admitted in so many words to the code of international law, but since in international councils every nation is entitled to the rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine is something we may justly claim it has its place in the code of international law as certainly as if it were so specifically mentioned, and when the United States is a tutor before the high tribunal that administers international law the question to be determined is whether or not we present claims which the justice of that code of law can find to be right and valid."

"The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in the principles of international law, which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced."

LORD SALISBURY AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

"Of course, this government is entirely confident that under the sanction of this doctrine we have clear rights and undoubted claims. Nor is this ignored in the British reply. The prime minister, while not admitting that the Monroe doctrine is applicable to present conditions, states:

"It is declaring that the United States would resist any such enterprise if it was contemplated. President Monroe adopted a policy which received the entire sympathy of the English government of that date."

"He further declares: 'Though the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of objects which most Englishmen would agree to be salutary, it is impossible to admit that they have been inscribed by any adequate authority in the code of international law.'

"Again he says: 'They (our majesty's government) fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of the European states would be a highly inexpedient change.'

"In the belief that the doctrine for which we contend was clear and definite, that it was founded upon substantial considerations and involved our safety and welfare, that it was fully applicable to our present conditions and to the state of the world's progress, and that it was directly related to the pending controversy, and without any conviction as to the final merits of the dispute, but anxious to learn in a satisfactory and conclusive manner whether Great Britain sought under a claim of boundary to extend her possessions on this continent without right, or whether she merely sought possession of territory safely included within her lines of ownership, this government proposed to the government of Great Britain a resort to arbitration as the proper means of settling the question, to the end that a vexatious boundary dispute between the two contestants might be determined and our exact standing and relation in respect to the controversy might be made clear."

OUR PROPOSITION DECLINED.

"It will be seen from the correspondence herewith submitted that this proposition has been declined by the British government, upon grounds which in the circumstances seem to me to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply disappointing that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings toward both nations directly concerned, addressed to the sense of justice and to the magnanimity of one of the great powers of the world, and touching its relations to one comparatively weak and small, should have produced no better results."

"The course to be pursued by this government in view of the present conditions does not appear to admit of serious doubt. Having labored faithfully for many years to induce Great Britain to submit this dispute to impartial arbitration, and having been now finally apprised of her refusal to do so, nothing remains but to accept the situation, to recognize its plain requirements and deal with it accordingly. Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States."

THE UNITED STATES MUST ACT.

"Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should, of course, be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claims of both parties."

UNITED STATES COMMISSION SUGGESTED.

"In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expense of a commission, to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a valid aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

"In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow."

NO CALAMITY LIKE SUPINE SUBMISSION.

"I am nevertheless firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and in the struggle for supremacy in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor beneath which is shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

"Executive Mansion, Dec. 17, 1895."

OLNEY'S STATEMENT AND SALISBURY'S REPLY.

Washington, Dec. 17.--Although the matter submitted to Congress in connection with the message consists of three diplomatic notes only, they are very voluminous. Mr. Olney's note to Mr. Bayard concerning the threatened aspect of affairs between Great Britain and Venezuela is first in the correspondence. It is dated July 30 last, and deals with the boundary question at great length.

Beginning at the very inception of the dispute which has now assumed so serious an aspect, Mr. Olney carries his argument of the American claim for arbitration, based on the Monroe doctrine, down to the present time, and gives emphasis to his statements by quoting the sentiments of President Monroe in full, and notes that his proposition by the Monroe administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain, who at once gave to it an open and unqualified adhesion, which has never been withdrawn."

Mr. Olney gives in his note a firm endorsement to the principle enunciated by Monroe and defines Great Britain's position in this frank and unambiguous manner:

"She (Great Britain) says to Venezuela: 'You can get none of the debatable land by force because you are not strong enough; you can get none by treaty, because I will not agree, and you can take your choice of getting a portion by arbitration only if you first agree to abandon to me such other portions as I may designate.'

Continuing, Mr. Olney says it is not perceived how such an attitude can be defended, nor how it is reconcilable with that love of justice and fair play so eminently characteristic of the English race, and holds that if such position be adhered to it should be regarded as amounting, in substance, to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory."

In conclusion Mr. Olney says that in these circumstances the duty of the president appears to him unmistakable and imperative. To ignore Great Britain's assertion of title and her refusal to have that title investigated and not to protest and give warning against the substantial appropriation of Great Britain of the territory for her own use would be to leave an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. He therefore instructed Mr. Bayard to lay the views given before Lord Salisbury, and said: "They (the views) call for a definite decision upon the point whether Great Britain will consent or will decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question to its entirety to the impartial arbitration."

Expressing the president's hope that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration, Mr. Olney concludes with the pointed statement that if the president "is to be disappointed in that hope, however a result not to be anticipated, and in his judgment, calculated to greatly embarrass the future relations between this country and Great Britain--it is his wish to be made acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before Congress in his next annual message."

SALISBURY'S REPLY.

Lord Salisbury's reply is addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote, British ambassador at Washington, under date of November 25 last. This dealt only with the application of the Monroe doctrine in the case at issue, and was followed on the same day by another note discussing the boundary dispute per se.

At the outset Lord Salisbury states that so far as he is aware the Monroe doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the government of either nation. He gives what he believes is the British interpretation of the doctrine, and maintains that the dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at the present day and adds that "it is intelligible that Mr. Olney should invoke in defence of the views on which he is now insisting an authority (Monroe) which enjoys so high a popularity with his own fellow countrymen."

The dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, avers Lord Salisbury, is a controversy with which the United States have no practical concern."

SALISBURY'S ARGUMENT.

Continuing in short, pithy sentences,

ed, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should, of course, be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claims of both parties."

UNITED STATES COMMISSION SUGGESTED.

"In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expense of a commission, to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a valid aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

"In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow."

NO CALAMITY LIKE SUPINE SUBMISSION.

"I am nevertheless firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and in the struggle for supremacy in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor beneath which is shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

"Executive Mansion, Dec. 17, 1895."

OLNEY'S STATEMENT AND SALISBURY'S REPLY.

Washington, Dec. 17.--Although the matter submitted to Congress in connection with the message consists of three diplomatic notes only, they are very voluminous. Mr. Olney's note to Mr. Bayard concerning the threatened aspect of affairs between Great Britain and Venezuela is first in the correspondence. It is dated July 30 last, and deals with the boundary question at great length.

Beginning at the very inception of the dispute which has now assumed so serious an aspect, Mr. Olney carries his argument of the American claim for arbitration, based on the Monroe doctrine, down to the present time, and gives emphasis to his statements by quoting the sentiments of President Monroe in full, and notes that his proposition by the Monroe administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain, who at once gave to it an open and unqualified adhesion, which has never been withdrawn."

Mr. Olney gives in his note a firm endorsement to the principle enunciated by Monroe and defines Great Britain's position in this frank and unambiguous manner:

"She (Great Britain) says to Venezuela: 'You can get none of the debatable land by force because you are not strong enough; you can get none by treaty, because I will not agree, and you can take your choice of getting a portion by arbitration only if you first agree to abandon to me such other portions as I may designate.'

Continuing, Mr. Olney says it is not perceived how such an attitude can be defended, nor how it is reconcilable with that love of justice and fair play so eminently characteristic of the English race, and holds that if such position be adhered to it should be regarded as amounting, in substance, to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory."

In conclusion Mr. Olney says that in these circumstances the duty of the president appears to him unmistakable and imperative. To ignore Great Britain's assertion of title and her refusal to have that title investigated and not to protest and give warning against the substantial appropriation of Great Britain of the territory for her own use would be to leave an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. He therefore instructed Mr. Bayard to lay the views given before Lord Salisbury, and said: "They (the views) call for a definite decision upon the point whether Great Britain will consent or will decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question to its entirety to the impartial arbitration."

Expressing the president's hope that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration, Mr. Olney concludes with the pointed statement that if the president "is to be disappointed in that hope, however a result not to be anticipated, and in his judgment, calculated to greatly embarrass the future relations between this country and Great Britain--it is his wish to be made acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before Congress in his next annual message."

SALISBURY'S REPLY.

Lord Salisbury's reply is addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote, British ambassador at Washington, under date of November 25 last. This dealt only with the application of the Monroe doctrine in the case at issue, and was followed on the same day by another note discussing the boundary dispute per se.

At the outset Lord Salisbury states that so far as he is aware the Monroe doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the government of either nation. He gives what he believes is the British interpretation of the doctrine, and maintains that the dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at the present day and adds that "it is intelligible that Mr. Olney should invoke in defence of the views on which he is now insisting an authority (Monroe) which enjoys so high a popularity with his own fellow countrymen."

The dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, avers Lord Salisbury, is a controversy with which the United States have no practical concern."

SALISBURY'S ARGUMENT.

Continuing in short, pithy sentences,

ed, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should, of course, be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claims of both parties."

UNITED STATES COMMISSION SUGGESTED.

"In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expense of a commission, to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a valid aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

"In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow."

NO CALAMITY LIKE SUPINE SUBMISSION.

"I am nevertheless firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and in the struggle for supremacy in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor beneath which is shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

"Executive Mansion, Dec. 17, 1895."

OLNEY'S STATEMENT AND SALISBURY'S REPLY.

Washington, Dec. 17.--Although the matter submitted to Congress in connection with the message consists of three diplomatic notes only, they are very voluminous. Mr. Olney's note to Mr. Bayard concerning the threatened aspect of affairs between Great Britain and Venezuela is first in the correspondence. It is dated July 30 last, and deals with the boundary question at great length.

Beginning at the very inception of the dispute which has now assumed so serious an aspect, Mr. Olney carries his argument of the American claim for arbitration, based on the Monroe doctrine, down to the present time, and gives emphasis to his statements by quoting the sentiments of President Monroe in full, and notes that his proposition by the Monroe administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain, who at once gave to it an open and unqualified adhesion, which has never been withdrawn."

Mr. Olney gives in his note a firm endorsement to the principle enunciated by Monroe and defines Great Britain's position in this frank and unambiguous manner:

"She (Great Britain) says to Venezuela: 'You can get none of the debatable land by force because you are not strong enough; you can get none by treaty, because I will not agree, and you can take your choice of getting a portion by arbitration only if you first agree to abandon to me such other portions as I may designate.'

Continuing, Mr. Olney says it is not perceived how such an attitude can be defended, nor how it is reconcilable with that love of justice and fair play so eminently characteristic of the English race, and holds that if such position be adhered to it should be regarded as amounting, in substance, to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory."

In conclusion Mr. Olney says that in these circumstances the duty of the president appears to him unmistakable and imperative. To ignore Great Britain's assertion of title and her refusal to have that title investigated and not to protest and give warning against the substantial appropriation of Great Britain of the territory for her own use would be to leave an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. He therefore instructed Mr. Bayard to lay the views given before Lord Salisbury, and said: "They (the views) call for a definite decision upon the point whether Great Britain will consent or will decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question to its entirety to the impartial arbitration."

Expressing the president's hope that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration, Mr. Olney concludes with the pointed statement that if the president "is to be disappointed in that hope, however a result not to be anticipated, and in his judgment, calculated to greatly embarrass the future relations between this country and Great Britain--it is his wish to be made acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before Congress in his next annual message."

SALISBURY'S REPLY.

Lord Salisbury's reply is addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote, British ambassador at Washington, under date of November 25 last. This dealt only with the application of the Monroe doctrine in the case at issue, and was followed on the same day by another note discussing the boundary dispute per se.

At the outset Lord Salisbury states that so far as he is aware the Monroe doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the government of either nation. He gives what he believes is the British interpretation of the doctrine, and maintains that the dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at the present day and adds that "it is intelligible that Mr. Olney should invoke in defence of the views on which he is now insisting an authority (Monroe) which enjoys so high a popularity with his own fellow countrymen."

The dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, avers Lord Salisbury, is a controversy with which the United States have no practical concern."

SALISBURY'S ARGUMENT.

Continuing in short, pithy sentences,

ed, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should, of course, be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claims of both parties."

UNITED STATES COMMISSION SUGGESTED.

"In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expense of a commission, to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a valid aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

"In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow."

NO CALAMITY LIKE SUPINE SUBMISSION.

"I am nevertheless firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and in the struggle for supremacy in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor beneath which is shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

"Executive Mansion, Dec. 17, 1895."

OL